

#### REMARKS

The Examiner's objection to Claims 1-21, because of the informality that Claim 1 should start with "A communication system..." not "What is claimed is" has been corrected by cancelling Claim 1.

The Examiner's objection to Claims 1-21, under 35 U.S.C. 112 Second ¶ as being indefinite for failing to particular point out and distinctively claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is respectfully traversed. In Claims 1-21 the limitation "The transmission of the transmitter (1) has been referred to in each of the claims where applicable to provide a sufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims that it appears in.

Claims 4 has been cancelled and Claim 5 has been amended to include an antecedent basis for the limitations referring to "the first output (16) of the receiver (2)" and "the first input (13) of the transmitter (1)".

With respect to Claims 6-10, applicant has cancelled Claim 6 and has amended Claims 7-10 to provide a sufficient antecedent basis for "the second input (11) of the transmitter (1)" in Claim 6 lines 1 and 2.

Claim 11 has been cancelled.

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 4, 14, 15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Bridle, et al. (U.S. 6, 163, 680) is respectfully traversed. Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-4, and 14. Applicant has amended Claims 15, 17, and 18 which are dependant

claims to refer back to a claim that has been indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. These actions should overcome the Examiner's rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b).

Bridle, et al. (U.S. 6, 163, 680) discloses a two-way radio communication system and method for establishing communication that is functionally quite different than the system described and claimed by applicant in applicant's claims. Bridle, et al. is concerned more with multiple pairs of radios without group interference and stores memory lists with different channels. Applicant, as stated above, cancelled Claims 1-4 and amended the remaining claims to depend from allowable claims which completely describe and recite an invention that is different and allowable over the device shown in Bridle, et al. The Examiner has indicated that Claims 5, 7-10, 13, and 20 would be allowable if written to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 Second ¶ and include the limitation of the base claim which has been accomplished.

The Examiner's rejections of Claims 2, 11, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bridle, et al. (U.S. 6, 163, 680) in view of Ekman, et al. (U.S. 5, 960, 355) is respectfully traversed. Applicant herein reiterates comments above concerning the Bridle, et al. reference. The Ekman, et al. reference provides a method, terminals and a service node for geographically positioning a first mobile radio terminal within a radio network using the position of radio base stations and second fixed radio terminals. The system described in Ekman, et al. is quite different than applicant's claimed invention recited in applicant's amended claims and Bridle, et al. It is applicant's position that even if one were to combine the teachings of Ekman, et al. with the

teachings of Bridle, et al. it would not have been obvious to arrive at applicant's claimed invention. Claims 2 and 11 have been cancelled. Claim 16 depends from Claim 14 which now depends from Claim 13 that was indicated allowable if amended. Further the Examiner has noted that certain claims would be allowed if they are amended and written in independent form to contain the limitations of the base claim. This has been accomplished. Therefore it is believed that Claim 16 is now allowable.

The Examiner's rejection of the Claims 6, 12, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bridle, et al. in view of Raith U.S. 5,930,706 is respectfully traversed.

Applicant herein recites the comments above concerning Bridle, et al. and Ekman, et al. Raith discloses detecting messages transmitted over a communications channel such as a paging channel. Specifically Raith provides a method and apparatus for detecting messages transmitted over a communications channel such as a paging channel in cellular radio systems. Again it is applicant's position that Raith discloses and describes a communication system quite different than that described and claimed by the applicant in applicant's amended claims. Again it is asserted that one of the ordinary skill of the art would not utilize or combine the teachings of Raith with the other references of Bridle, et al. and Ekman, et al. to arrive at applicant's claimed invention.

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 5, 7-10, 13, and 20 would be allowable if written to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second ¶ set forth in the office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended the

In re application of: ACR Electronics, Inc.  
Serial No.: 10/709,928  
Page 10

claims as required by the Examiner. In addition, applicant has amended some of the other claims to also depend from claims that are indicated to be allowable by the Examiner. Therefore, it is believed that Claims 5-10 and 13-21 are now allowable over the art of record.

Date: September 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Barry L. Haley, Esq.  
(Reg. No. 25,339)

MALIN HALEY DiMAGGIO  
BOWEN & LHOTA, P.A.  
1936 South Andrews Avenue  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316  
Telephone: 954.763.3303  
Facsimile: 954.522.6507  
E-Mail: info@mhdpatents.com